



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the caption indicated merely the place where it was issued, and not the authority by which it was issued. *Beach v. O'Riley*, 14 W. Va. 55. The same view has been taken in Michigan. *Forbes v. Darling*, 94 Mich. 621, 7 N. W. 385. And also in an earlier Missouri case. *Fowler v. Watson*, 4 Mo. 27. However, it is immaterial in what part of the process the commonwealth is introduced, just so the command is given in its name. *White v. Commonwealth*, 6 Binney (Pa.) 17, 6 Am. Dec. 443.

On the other hand, it has been held that such constitutional provision is merely directory, and that process which does not run in the name of the state may be valid, provided it does not affect the substantial rights of the parties. *Truitt v. Baird*, 12 Kan. 420; *Creason v. Yardley*, *supra*. And where process commenced "State of Texas, County of Austin * * *," it was held that the name of the county might be rejected as mere surplusage. *Portis v. Parker*, 8 Tex. 23, 58 Am. Dec. 95.

This identical question seems never to have come up before the Supreme Court of Virginia. However, it has been held in Virginia that any count in an indictment was void, which failed to conclude "against the peace and dignity of the commonwealth," as provided by the constitution. *Commonwealth v. Carney*, 4 Gratt. 546; *Thompson v. Commonwealth*, 20 Gratt. 724; *Early v. Commonwealth*, 86 Va. 921.

The holding of the instant case that constitutional provisions are merely directory is manifestly unsound. But there may still be some ground for holding the order of publication to be sufficient, since it is merely constructive process, and the view might be taken that such is not process within the purview of the constitution. It has been held that although the state constitution provides that all process shall run in the name of the state, it is still within the power of the legislature to authorize notice of the institution of a suit to be given by an attorney or a party, instead of through a writ issuing out of court. *Gilmer v. Bird*, 15 Fla. 410.

CONTRACTS—CONSIDERATION—PERFORMANCE OF LEGAL OBLIGATION.—The defendant's daughter was engaged to marry G. The defendant made a contract with G, by which he promised to pay to his daughter in consideration of the marriage being consummated a certain sum of money annually. The marriage followed and for ten years the defendant continued to pay the annual instalments. The plaintiff held an assignment of the contract, and on the default of the defendant in the payment of an instalment, he brought an action on the contract. The defendant contended that there was no consideration for the agreement, because G was already engaged to the defendant's daughter and was under a legal duty to marry her. *Held*, there was consideration for the contract. *De Cicco v. Schweizer* (N. Y.), 117 N. E. 807. See NOTES, p. 354.

DIVORCE—GROUNDS—DESERTION.—A husband permitted his mother, who was a member of his family, to interfere with the household management and by word and act to otherwise make the wife's life unendurable. The wife left her husband, who made no attempt to effect a reconciliation and continued to keep his mother in charge of his household. Later suit was brought by the husband on the ground of desertion.